

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity to discuss the outstanding Final Office Action during the telephone interview on July 13, 2011. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicant's representative, Sergio Chung, discussed how the inventions claimed in independent claims 88 and 96 can be distinguished over the cited references. The discussion was focused on the recitation of "an alignment arrangement configured to extend outward from the perimeter of the first endless frame structure." A tentative agreement was reached with the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that independent claims 88 and 96 would be allowable if they were amended to recite that the alignment arrangement is 1) located above the first endless frame structure and 2) extends laterally outward, beyond the perimeter of the first endless frame structure. The Examiner also indicated that she would be willing to enter the amendments to claims 88 and 96 in an After-Final Response.

In the Final Office Action dated May 10, 2011, in which claims 79-100 were pending, the Examiner:

rejected claims 79-81, 84-88, 93-96, 99-104 and 108-110 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,856,663 to Colditz et al. ("Colditz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,336,432 to Wilson ("Wilson") and U.S. Patent No. 860,359 to Dudley ("Dudley");

rejected claim 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colditz in view of Wilson, Dudley, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,960,242 to Saxonmeyer ("Saxonmeyer"); and

objected to claims 89-92, 97, 98 and 105-107 as being dependent on rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant hereby amends claims 88 and 96; and cancels claims 101-104. Claim 82 was previously withdrawn. Claims 79-81, 83-100 and 105-110 are presented for the Examiner's consideration. Claims 88 and 96 are independent claims.

Claims 88 and 96 have been amended to make minor editorial changes and to recite the language suggested by the Examiner, which the Examiner indicated would make the claims allowable. Support for the amendments to claims 88 and 96 can be found in at least Figures 17-19 and paragraphs [0179]-[0183] of the specification. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims.

With respect to the rejection of claims 79-81, 84-88, 93-96, 99-104 and 108-110 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colditz in view of Wilson and Dudley, amended claims 88 and 96 each recite, *inter alia*, “an alignment arrangement disposed above the first endless frame structure and extending laterally outward, beyond the perimeter of the first endless path.” As indicated by the Examiner during the July 13, 2011 telephone interview, none of the cited references, whether alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this recitation. Therefore, Colditz, Wilson and Dudley, whether alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claims 88 and 96. Claims 79-81, 84-87, 93-95, 99-104 and 108-110 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended claims 88 and 96 and include additional recitations thereto. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons stated in connection with amended claims 88 and 96, Applicant respectfully submits that Colditz, Wilson and Dudley, whether alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 79-81, 84-87, 93-95, 99-104 and 108-110. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 79-81, 84-88, 93-96, 99-104 and 108-110 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colditz in view of Wilson and Dudley is improper and should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of claim 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colditz in view of Wilson, Dudley, and further in view of Saxonmeyer, claim 83 depends directly from amended claim 88 and includes additional recitations thereto. Again, as indicated by the Examiner during the July 13, 2011 telephone interview, none of the cited references, whether alone or in combination, teaches or suggests “an alignment arrangement disposed above the first endless frame structure and extending laterally outward, beyond the

perimeter of the first endless path,” as recited in amended claim 88. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Colditz, Wilson, Dudley and Saxonmeyer, whether alone or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 83. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colditz in view of Wilson, Dudley, and further in view of Saxonmeyer is improper and should be withdrawn.

With respect to the objection to claims 89-92, 97, 98 and 105-107 as being dependent on rejected base claims, claims 89-92, 97, 98 and 105-107 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claims 88 and 96. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claims 89-92, 97, 98 and 105-107 is now moot in view of the amendments to base claims 88 and 96, which Applicant respectfully submits are now in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 90-92, 98 and 105-107 are now also in condition for allowance.

Having traversed each and every objection and rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 79-81, 83-100 and 105-110 be passed to issue.

Applicant believes that no fees are due in connection with this amendment and response. If any fees are deemed necessary, authorization is hereby granted to charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Marina F. Cunningham/
Marina F. Cunningham
Registration No. 38,419
Attorney for Applicant

McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
CityPlace II
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut
06103-3410